

In the Drawings

Please add new drawing sheet 8, which includes new figure 8. The subject matter of new figure 8 is supported by the specification as originally filed (see par. [0032]).

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and objections is requested in light of the forgoing amendments and the following comments. Claims 29-50 are pending, with claims 29, 36, and 43 being the independent claims. No new matter is added by this Amendment.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 29-50 were rejected under the judicially created obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,923,706. A Terminal Disclaimer is being submitted with this Amendment. Accordingly, the Applicant requests that the double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

Drawing Objections

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Specifically, the Examiner states that the “plurality of frame segments” must be shown in the figures. The Applicant has amended the figures to include new Figure 8, which illustrates a frame member including a plurality of frame segments. New Figure 8 is supported by the specification as originally filed (see par. [0032]). Accordingly, the Applicant requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 33, 41, 42, 47, 48 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the subject matter of these claims is not supported by the original specification and, therefore, constitute new matter. These claims were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with these assertions.

Claim 33 recites “the frame member includes a corrosion resistant material” and claim 50 recites “the frame member is at least partially constructed of a corrosion resistant material.” The specification as originally filed recites “The frame member 120 may be coated with a layer of corrosion resistant material . . .” (see par. [0037]). The specification also recites “In various exemplary embodiments, the frame member 120 may be formed from a waterproof or corrosion resistant material . . .” (see par. [0037]). Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of claims 33 and 50 is supported by the specification as originally filed. The Applicant therefore request that the rejection of claims 33 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, be withdrawn.

Claim 41 recites “a second fabric portion extending substantially inwardly from the frame member into the opening, the second fabric portion having an area less than an area of the opening.” Claim 42 recites “a second fabric portion extending substantially inwardly from the frame member into the opening.” Claim 47 recites “ the second fabric portion extending substantially within the opening, the second fabric portion having an area less than an area of the opening.” Claim 48 has been amended to recite “ a second fabric portion coupled to the first fabric portion” to more clearly describe how the second fabric portion is coupled to the first fabric portion.

Figure 5 of the originally filed specification illustrates an example of an embodiment having a first fabric portion 510, and a second fabric portion 516, 518, where the second fabric portion is coupled to the first fabric portion. Moreover, the second fabric portion 516, 518 is clearly illustrated as extending substantially inwardly from the frame member 520 into the opening, and as having an area that is less than the area of the opening. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the limitations of claims 41, 42, 47 and amended claim 48 are supported by the originally filed specification. The Applicant therefore requests that the rejection of claims 41, 42, 47 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


All of the stated grounds for rejection and objection have been properly traversed or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections and objections. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has further questions in connection with this application or believes that personal communication would be helpful in the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Dated: February 17, 2006

Cooley Godward LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
One Freedom Square
Reston Town Center
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190-5656
Tel: (703) 456-8000
Fax: (703) 456-8100

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

By:

 (Reg. No. 41,087)
for:
Christopher R. Hutter
Nancy A. Vashaw
Reg. No. 50,501